

Appl. No. 10/708,196
Amdt. dated April 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 27, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Talbert (US 4,781,870).

5

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection and to more clearly claim the present invention. Claim 1 now recites a planar reflection mirror and a strengthening element adhered to the planar reflection mirror. Support for this amendment is found in Figures 3-5 of the instant application. No new matter is added.

10

While the amended claim 1 recites a planar reflection mirror, the cited prior art patents of Talbert and Stang teach spherical and parabolic mirrors, respectively. Although both Talbert and Stang teach strengthening elements for their mirrors, the strengthening elements used in curved mirrors do not serve the purpose of keeping the mirror from deforming or sagging due to the weight of gravity.

15

On the other hand, the present invention makes use of the strengthening element to keep the planar reflection mirror from experiencing deformation over time due to gravity, thereby causing the middle of the mirror to sag. Talbert and Stang both teach that the strengthening element is used for helping to produce the curved shapes of the mirrors, thereby ensuring that mirrors are manufactured with high yield and high quality. Curved mirrors present special problems and difficulties to manufacturers due to the curved shapes, and therefore are manufactured under different circumstances than planar mirrors.

20

Thus, there would be no motivation to adhere the strengthening elements taught by Talbert or Stang to the planar reflection mirror recited in claim 1 since the prior art strengthening elements are not necessary for planar structures, and are used for manufacturing curved mirrors.

25

Reconsideration of claim 1 is therefore requested. Claims 4-6 and 8 are dependent on

Appl. No. 10/708,196
Amdt. dated April 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 27, 2005

claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 4-6, and 8 is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

5 Claims 1, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Stang (US 4,124,277).

Response:

10 As explained above, the amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from both Talbert and Stang, taken either alone or in combination. Claims 6 and 7 are each dependent on the amended claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 6, and 7 is respectfully requested.

3. Introduction to new claims 10-12:

15 New claims 10 and 11 contains limitations stating that opposite ends of the strengthening element contain screw holes and the strengthened mirror structure comprises screws passing through the screw holes for securing the strengthening element to an object. New claim 12 contains a limitation stating that the strengthening element has a planar shape. All of these limitations are supported by
20 the specification and the drawings, and no new matter is added. Neither of the cited prior art references of Talbert and Stang teach the limitations contained in new claims 10-12. Acceptance of new claims 10-12 is respectfully requested.

4. Introduction to new claims 13-20:

25 New claim 13 claims a rear projection television comprising the strengthened mirror structure recited in claim 1. This new claim is supported by Figures 1 and 3B of the present invention. Since none of the cited prior art references teach the planar reflection mirror and other structures recited in claim 13, claim 13 is patentably

Appl. No. 10/708,196
Amdt. dated April 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 27, 2005

distinguished from the prior art. New claims 14-20 are duplicates of claims 6-12, and should be allowed if claim 13 is allowed. No new matter has been added through any of the new claims. Acceptance of new claims 13-20 is respectfully requested.

- 5 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

10 Winston Hsu Date: April 22, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

- 15 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan).